



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

231), *Nazirites* (pp. 152, 153), *slave dealing* (p. 71), *Return to God* (pp. 54, 168), *spiritual gifts* (pp. 64, 65), *visions* (pp. 126, 200, 201).

The book here reviewed will be a very convenient register of the best opinions upon Joel and Amos, and upon the production of it both author and publishers are to be congratulated.

CHARLES RUFUS BROWN.

THE NEWTON THEOLOGICAL INSTITUTION.

Primeval Revelation, Studies in Gen. I–VIII. By J. CYND DYLAN JONES, [†]D.D. New York: American Tract Society, 1897. Pp. xiii+366, 8vo.

In his preface the author frankly avows his intention “to interpret these chapters on the traditional hypothesis.” He is unable, however, to ignore the fact that there are divergent theories, and, accordingly, he devotes his introduction to a discussion of the “Pentateuch and Criticism.”

He begins by depreciating technical, exegetical science as less adapted to bring out the meaning of a passage than “poetic imagination.” It must be a comfort to him to believe that such learning is an encumbrance to the expositor, for he does not possess it. Although he is sure that “the critics” are wrong, he has no clear conception of their aim, method, or results. He apparently has not read even the recent German literature on Old Testament criticism, much less the Dutch. The only works, cited are those of de Wette, Rosenmüller, and other critics of the beginning of the century, together with a few modern books that have chanced to be translated. The important recent works on Semitic cosmology by Jensen and Gunkel seem to be unknown. On p. 159 “*amuthig*” (*anmuthig?*), meaning “pleasant, agreeable,” is declared to be an Ethiopic word from which “a few rationalists” derive the name Adam! A reading of this book leaves it an open question whether its author knows even Hebrew otherwise than at second hand. On p. 3 we are told that “heart” in the language of the Old Testament is used in contrast to the intellectual faculties. On p. 26 *hōō* (*sic*) and *na’ar* used as feminines are pronounced “archaisms.” On p. 147 it is inferred from the plural *hayyim* that “plurality of lives is here ascribed to man.”

After this general depreciation of the method by which the critics reach their conclusions the author adduces three *a priori* arguments against their theories: first, that criticism is essentially destructive; second, that the “higher critics” have no right to arrogate to them-

selves that they "surpass all others in scholarship, ability, and insight;" third, that the critics are disbelievers in the supernatural: all of which shows only how little the author understands what higher criticism is.

Having settled in advance from the character of the critics that their theories cannot be true, Dr. Jones thinks that it is now safe to let us know what these theories are. "In order to do the higher critics full justice," he says, "I will here quote the language of the learned and venerable Bishop of Bath and Wells." (Would it not be quite as fair to let the critics speak for themselves?) Learned and venerable as the bishop may be, he is not aware that the first Elohist is the same as P, that P^r is the same as the Holiness Code, that Q is only a part of P, and that the book of the Covenant does not belong to P. The critical theory as stated by the bishop our author rightly pronounces repugnant to common sense and universal experience.

After this introduction we can easily imagine what will follow in the body of the book. The plural *Elohim* in Gen. 1:1 and the plural "us" in v. 3 are indications of the doctrine of the Trinity. There are no contradictions between the Mosaic account of creation and geology or astronomy, or, if contradictions exist, science is uncertain and will some day change its mind. The evolution theory is destitute of evidence. Man was formed "not out of the ground, but out of the dust of the ground—a subtile distinction which carries with it a world of meaning." The "generations" of Genesis, including the "generations of the heavens," were not invented by Moses. "It is evident that they were transmitted from ancient times and sacredly preserved in the archives of the children of Israel." Eve was not made until some time after Adam, since "the improbability is great that God would throw the newly made creature into a state of unnecessary agitation and excitement." The questions are gravely discussed whether Eve was made out of a rib or out of the side of Adam, and whether or not the serpent originally walked erect.

L. B. PATON.